		E-Filed 8/27/10			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Jason Flanders (SBN 238007) SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER, INC. 785 Market Street, Suite 850 San Francisco, California 94103 Telephone: (415) 856-0444 Facsimile: (415) 856-0443 Email: jason@baykeeper.org Christopher Sproul (SBN 126398) ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES 5135 Anza Street San Francisco, California 94121 Telephone: (415) 533-3376 Facsimile: (415) 358-5695				
10	Email: csproul@enviroadvocates.com				
11	Attorneys for Intervenor-Plaintiff BAYKEEPER, INC.				
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS			
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO WITHDRAW			
16	SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER,	INTERVENTION OPPOSITION, ACCEPT			
17	Intervenor-Plaintiff,	SERVICE, AND LIMIT CLAIMS IN INTERVENTION			
18	v.				
19	CITY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,				
20	Defendants.				
21					
22 23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	STIPULATION RE INTERVENTION	Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS			

STIPULATION RE INTERVENTION

STIPULATION

Whereas, on December 3, 2009, the United States of America, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency, filed a complaint against the City of Alameda, City of Albany, City of Berkeley, City of Emeryville, City of Oakland, City of Piedmont and the Stege Sanitary District (collectively, "Satellites" or "Defendants") pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Water Act (this "Action"), which complaint has not yet been served on Defendants;

Whereas, on December 22, 2009, San Francisco Baykeeper ("Baykeeper" or "Intervenor") filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to Intervene in this Action;

Whereas, on January 22, 2010, the Court granted Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene, prior to the deadline set forth in the Clerk's January 13, 2010 Notice for filing an opposition to Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene;

Whereas, on January 28, 2010, Baykeeper filed a Complaint in Intervention, and served the Complaint in Intervention upon the Satellites, the California State Water Resources Control Board, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, via U.S. Mail, and upon the United States via United States District Court Electronic Filing service (collectively "Parties");

Whereas, on January 29, 2010, Defendants timely filed a Joint Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene, and on February 11, 2010, Baykeeper timely filed a Reply to Defendants' Joint Opposition;

Whereas, on February 10, 2010, the Court entered as an Order the Parties' Stipulation to Stay litigation, which Order allowed for the Court to rule on Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene and January 22, 2010 Order during the stay period;

Whereas, on May 26, 2010, the Court entered as an Order the Parties' Stipulation to extend the stay period to October 8, 2010, to enable the Parties to continue settlement negotiations, which settlement negotiations are ongoing;

Whereas, to facilitate any potential settlement of this Action, the Parties desire to resolve any uncertainty regarding Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene and Complaint in Intervention;

THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE THAT:

Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS

1	1. Defendants withdraw their January 29, 2010, Joint Memorandum of Points and Authorities in			
2	Opposition to San Francisco Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene, and do not oppose			
3	Baykeeper's intervention in this Action.			
4	2. Each Party has been served with Baykeeper's Complaint in Intervention in satisfaction of the			
5	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and no Party will raise as a defense or objection to			
6	Baykeeper's Complaint in Intervention, the adequacy or timing of service of Baykeeper's			
7	Complaint in Intervention.			
8	3. The time for Defendants to respond in any way to Baykeeper's Complaint in Intervention			
9	shall be tolled while the present stay is in effect and Baykeeper shall not raise lack of			
10		timeliness as a defense or objection		
11	4	•	·	
12	4. Baykeeper's claims in this Action shall be limited to the claims in the United States'			
1	December 3, 2009 complaint, as such complaint may be amended, including but not limited			
13	to, include claims of the California State Water Resources Control Board and the California			
14	Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, in this Action.			
15	5 Dated: August 24, 2010			
16	Dated: August 24, 2010			
17	/S/ Jason	ı Flanders	/S/ Michelle Kenyon	
18	Jason Flai		Michelle Kenyon	
19		isco Baykeeper	City Attorney	
20	For Interv	enor-Plaintiff	For Defendant City of Piedmont	
21	/S/ Fllen	J. Garber	/S/ Kenton L. Alm	
41	Ellen J. G		Kenton L. Alm	
22	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP For Defendant City of Alameda		Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson	
23			Attorneys for Defendants City of Albany and Stege Sanitary District	
24			City of Atloung and Stege Samtary District	
25	/S/ Zach	Cowan	/S/ Marilee J. Allan	
26	Zach Cow		Marilee J. Allan Pingham McCutahan LLP	
27	City Attor	dant City of Berkeley	Bingham McCutchen LLP Attorneys for Defendant City of Oakland	
28				
	STIPLE AT	ION RE INTERVENTION	Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS	
	JIII ODAI	IOI. AD HAIDAADHAIOIA	- 3 -	

	Case 3.09-cv-05064-R5 Document 47 Filed 06/27/10 Page 4 015
1	/S/ Michael G. Biddle
2	Michael G. Biddle
3	Michael G. Biddle City Attorneys For Defendant City of Emeryville
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	STIPULATION RE INTERVENTION Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS
	-4-

Case 3:09-cv-05684-RS Document 47 Filed 08/27/10 Page 5 of 5

1		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$		
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$		
4		
5		
6	-[PROPOSED] ORI	DER
7		
8		
9	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10		
11	Reblach	8/26/10
12	U.S. District Court Judge	Date
13	_	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	[PROPOSED ORDER]	Civil Case No.: CV 09-5684 RS
	- 5 -	CIVII Case 110 C v 09-3084 RS